

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Examiner's Final Office Action dated March 6, 2009.

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner in the telephonic interview of May 6, 2009.

Claims 56, 58, 60-64, 66, 68-72, 74, 76-80, 82 and 84-88 are pending in the application.

Claims 56, 58, 60-64, 66, 68-72, 74, 76-80, 82 and 84-88 have been rejected.

Claims 56, 58, 63, 64, 66, 71,72, 74, 79, 80, 82, 84, 87 and 88 are amended

Claims 57, 65, 73 and 81 are cancelled

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 56, 58, 60-64, 66, 68-72, 74, 76-80, 82 and 84-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,754,661 B1 issued to Brookler et al., (“Brookler”). Applicants have chosen to respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection, insofar as the rejection might be applied to the amended claims, as follows. Applicants reserve the right, for example, in a continuing application, to establish that the cited reference, or other references cited now or hereafter, do not qualify as prior art as to an invention embodiment previously, currently, or subsequently claimed.

As will be appreciated, “[a] ... claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051,

1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully submit that this burden has not been met by the present Office Action. Amended Claim 56, for example, recites:

56. A computer-implemented method comprising:
selecting a child class from a class hierarchy, wherein
the class hierarchy comprises
the child class, and
a parent class,
the parent class and the child class are associated with one another,
the child class is configured to inherit an attribute of the parent class,
the child class comprises one or more associated attributes,
the one or more associated attributes comprise the attribute,
the one or more associated attributes are configured to describe the item,
the selecting the child class is based on the one or more associated attributes,
the selecting the child class is performed such that each of the one or more
associated attributes has a non-null value to describe the item,
the attribute has a first domain associated with the parent class and a second
domain associated with the child class, and
the second domain is more restrictive than the first domain;
associating the item with the child class, wherein
the attribute describes one or more members of the child class,
the one or more associated attributes are necessary to describe the item, and
the one or more associated attributes are associated with the child class in the
class hierarchy;
storing a first record associating
the item, and
the child class; and
storing a second record associating the item with
the attribute, and
a value of the attribute.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Brookler* fails to teach the elements recited in Applicants' Claim 56. Likewise, *Brookler* fails to teach the limitations of independent Claims 64, 72 and 80, which have been amended to recite comparable limitations to those of Claim 56 and are rejected under logic substantially similar to that applied in the rejection of Claim 56.

Specifically, amended Claim 56 now recites, "the attribute has a first domain associated with the parent class and a second domain associated with the child class, and the second domain is more restrictive than the first domain." Support for this amendment is found, for example, in

at least page 3, line 20 and page 9, line 22 of the present Specification. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to recite “the attribute has a first domain associated with the parent class and a second domain associated with the child class, and the second domain is more restrictive than the first domain” adds no new matter. Applicants have inspected *Brookler* and have do not discerned any teaching or suggestion comparable to the claimed “the attribute has a first domain associated with the parent class and a second domain associated with the child class, and the second domain is more restrictive than the first domain.”

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that *Brookler* does not anticipate amended Claim 56. Claims 64, 72 and 80 are rejected under similar reasoning and are, likewise, patentable over *Brookler*. Similarly, Claims 58-63, 64, 65-70, 73-79 and 82-87 depend from and further patentably distinguish Claims 56, 64, 72 and 80, respectively, and are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore request the Examiner’s reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to those claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103


Claim 88 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Brookler* and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,602 issued to Tso (“*Tso*”). As Claim 88 depends from and further patentably distinguishes allowable amended Claim 56, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 88 is likewise allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen A. Mason
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 64,303
Telephone: (512) 439-5098
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099